

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Oh et al., U.S. Patent 5,646,699. Claims 2-3 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 4-10 are in the application.

The specification and claim 7 have been amended as indicated by the Examiner.

On the merits, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a television receiver for use in a home cinema system, the receiver comprising a tuner configured to receive and separate broadcast video and audio signals; a display screen coupled with a display driver arranged to receive and display video signals from the tuner; one or more speakers coupled with audio signal processing means arranged to receive, process and output two or more audio channel signals from the tuner; and an input for a further audio signal, said input coupled to a control and switching means operable to (1) connect said input to the audio signal processing means, (2) disconnect the coupling of tuner and audio signal processing means, (3) set the receiver to a predetermined volume and (4) enables selective output of the two or

more audio channel signals to a plurality external speakers and the one or more speakers, whilst coupled to said input.

Oh fails to teach, show or imply the limitations an input for a further audio signal, said input coupled to a control and switching means operable to (1) connect said input to the audio signal processing means, (2) disconnect the coupling of tuner and audio signal processing means, (3) set the receiver to a predetermined volume and (4) enables selective output of the two or more audio channel signals to a plurality external speakers and the one or more speakers, whilst coupled to said input, as specifically recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants find nothing the Oh that shows or implies the elements as claimed.

Next, it is not seen how Oh's integrated CD player and television receiver and associated collection of elements anticipates the claimed invention as asserted in the Office Action, without improper hindsight by "use[ing] the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention," see *In Re Denis Rouffet*, 47 USPQ.2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Although, Oh suggests a CDP 34 and third selector 62 they are used to solve a particular problem (i.e. integration of these components), and no motivation has been provided by the Office Action to show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the

inventor would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed, see Id.

Accordingly, at least for these reasons, independent Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Claims 4-10 in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are, therefore, believed allowable and patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully request, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Daniel J. Piotrowski, Reg. 42,079  
Senior Patent Counsel  
(914) 333-9624

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Alexandria, VA 22313

On July 24, 2003

By Neem Chpc